

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/571,997

Applicant(s)

BUCHOLD ET AL.

Examiner

Peter F. Godenschwager

Art Unit

1796

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Peter F. Godenschwager.

(3) _____.

(2) Jonathon Myers.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 December 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: none.

Identification of prior art discussed: Smith (US Pat. No. 4,443,622).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

MARK EASHOO, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was agreed that the LaMattina et al. (US Pat. No. 4,443,621) reference cited in the office action mailed November 15, 2007 should instead be cited as Smith (US Pat. No. 4,443,622). The Smith reference scanned in the patent database has the LaMattina et al. cover sheet. In addition, columns 3 and 4 of Smith are missing, and columns 3 and 4 of Lamattina et al. have been scanned in their place. It was agreed that a complete copy of Smith would be forwarded to applicant's representative when it became available.